DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 395 472 FL 023 802

AUTHOR O'Brien, Maureen
TITLE Partners in Learning: A Task-based Advanced Speaking Course.
PUB DATE 96
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (Chicago, IL, March 27, 1996).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Advanced Students; *Classroom Techniques; *English (Second Language); Group Activities; Needs Assessment; Participative Decision Making; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; *Self Evaluation (Groups); *Student Participation; *Task Analysis

ABSTRACT

This report describes a semester of teaching a group of non-native English-speaking students, aged 17 to 40 years and how the instructor identified three elements that appeared to be necessary for a task-based, advanced English speaking class. The three elements were: (1) ongoing needs assessment; (2) collaboration between instructor and students in designing tasks; and (3) regular student assessment of their accomplishment of these tasks. The use of each element in the classroom is outlined in detail. A major benefit to this approach was that students improved in areas where they and their fellow classmates saw a clear need for improvement. Use of this teaching/learning style offered the instructor the chance to enhance the students' language proficiency by creating conditions in which they were able to engage in meaningful interaction while their primary attention was focused, not on explicit features of the language, but rather on understanding the language, using the language, and working with the language that they felt they needed. Students and teacher felt the class was worthwhile because it honored the complex interrelationships of all the factors that influenced what and how each student learned, and because the students themselves were an integral part of determining the content and style of the course. A detailed, thorough definition of the word "task" and its use in language study are included. Assessment forms used in the class are appended. (Contains 10 references.) (NAV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Maureen M
O'Brien

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

ED 395 472

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to
improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this
document do not necessarily represent
official OERI position or policy.

1996 TESOL Convention
Chicago, IL
Presentation #3754
March 27, 1996

Partners in learning: A task-based advanced speaking course

Maureen O'Brien
Cornell University, Department of Modern Languages
(Intensive English Program)

A. Some definitions of task

B. Following a task-based approach

C. Description of my class/*Pedagogic task* as it applies to this class

D. Three elements of this task-based course
   1. An ongoing needs assessment
   2. Teacher-student collaboration in designing tasks
   3. Student assessment of task accomplishment

E. Conclusion

FL023802

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Task has been defined in a number of ways. Most commonly, these definitions focus on what a person *does* (rather than what he or she *says*), whether in the classroom or in the "real world." For example, Graham Crookes (1986, cited in Kumaravadivelu 1993, 70) has defined *task* as "a piece of work or an activity, usually with a specified objective, undertaken as part of an educational course, or at work, or used to elicit data for research." For Rod Ellis (1994), *task* refers to "some kind of activity designed to engage the learner in using the language communicatively or reflectively in order to arrive at an outcome other than that of learning a specified feature of the L2" (595). Ellis points out that his definition does not accord with those that see *task* as referring to both form-oriented and meaning-oriented activities. For David Nunan (1989), a *communicative* task is one that focuses on meaning rather than on linguistic structure. He defines *communicative task* as "a piece of classroom work which involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing or interacting in the target language while their attention is principally focused on meaning rather than form" (10). He acknowledges that it is not always possible to make a hard and fast distinction between a "communicative," or meaning-focused, and a "non-communicative," or form-focused, task, mainly because meaning and form are so closely interrelated. Michael Long and Crookes (1992) make a distinction between a focus on *forms*--"that is, ...the use of some kind of synthetic syllabus and/or a linguistically isolating teaching 'method,' such as audiolingualism, the Silent Way, or Total Physical Response"--and a focus on *form*--"that is, [the] use of pedagogic tasks and other methodological options which draw students' attention to aspects of the target language code" (43). One source of

cues for classroom teachers about when a focus on form will be productive is the language, both grammatical and ungrammatical, that learners produce in completing a communicative task (Long and Crookes 1992).

In addition to their distinction between a focus on *forms* and a focus on *form*, Long and Crookes (1992) make a distinction between *target tasks*--the "real-world" tasks that students are preparing to undertake (e.g., buying a train ticket, taking lecture notes)--and *pedagogic tasks*--sequenced classroom tasks that are "increasingly complex approximations to the target tasks which motivated their inclusion" in the syllabus (44). This is similar to Earl Stevick's (1971) distinction between *real* and *realistic* use of language: "I really use the question 'What time is it?' only if (a) I don't know what time it is and (b) I want to know what time it is. I can use the same question *realistically* if I can foresee the time when I might really use it" (29-30).

Long and Crookes (1992) make it clear that in a task-based approach to language teaching, decisions about task simplicity and complexity are made not after applying traditional linguistic grading criteria, but after considering aspects of the intellectual challenge posed by the pedagogic tasks themselves--e.g., the number of solutions to a problem, the number of parties involved in the task, the amount and kind of language required.

William Tikunoff (1985) also looks at aspects of task performance other than purely linguistic ones. According to him, tasks make the following kinds of demands on students:

1. **response mode demands** (the cognitive, affective, and motor/sensory skills that a task demands)
2. **interactional mode demands** (i.e., the student's understanding of the classroom norms governing task accomplishment, whether the student is working alone, in a group, or with help from the teacher)
3. **task and communicative complexity demands** (the student's language proficiency and familiarity with the instructional context, which influence his or her perception of task complexity and, therefore, task difficulty)

Nunan (1991) gives the following five characteristics of a task-based approach to language teaching:

1. An emphasis on learning to communicate through interaction in the target language
2. The introduction of authentic texts into the learning situation
3. The provision of opportunities for learners to focus, not only on language, but also on the learning process itself
4. An enhancement of the learner's own personal experiences as important contributing elements to classroom learning
5. An attempt to link classroom language learning with language activation outside the classroom (279).

Task-based language teaching takes an analytic approach to second-language teaching and learning. It focuses on *how* the language is to be learned rather than

on *what* is to be learned. Taking a task-based approach means looking at the purposes for which people are learning a language and at what specific kinds of language performance are necessary for them to fulfill these purposes. The teacher and the learners negotiate course objectives as the course progresses, and they assess accomplishment of the course objectives according to criteria that the learners have helped to set. Teachers who follow an analytic approach present whole chunks of the target language at one time, without imposing any structural or lexical control on the language. In a synthetic approach, on the other hand, the target language is separated into discrete linguistic units (e.g., structures or functions) that are independent of one another, and that are taught individually and step by step. The assumption is that learners will synthesize these pieces of the language when they need to use them in order to communicate (Long and Crookes, 1992).

Looking at language as discrete linguistic units does not take into account how complex the term "language proficiency" is. In addition to involving proficiency in four interrelated (and often inseparable) skills--speaking, listening, reading, and writing--it includes grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competence (Clair 1994; Canale and Swain 1980). It also includes some degree of what might be called cultural competence: for example, some knowledge of the values, beliefs, assumptions, and expectations of users of the target language (both native and non-native), and some recognition of references to target-language cultural figures and events. It is an especially complex term when it is applied to language learners intending to do undergraduate or graduate work in the U.S. For students, "language proficiency" implies proficiency both in social language and in

academic language (Clair 1994). Furthermore, within the category of academic language, proficiency as a social science researcher, for example, may not equal proficiency as a literary critic.

An analytical approach--and particularly a task-based approach--allows learners to address this complexity in a more effective way than a synthetic approach does. It acknowledges the fact that language learning, which also involves the acquisition of social and cultural knowledge and skills, is a psycholinguistic process (Long and Crookes 1992). It also focuses on the actual tasks that learners have to or will have to perform. Finally, such an approach recognizes the fact that each learner brings his or her unique personal history, knowledge, personality, preferences, expectations, strengths, and weaknesses to the classroom. Recognition of this fact allows teachers to create a learning centered-classroom in which learning goes in three directions: teacher to student, student to student, and student to teacher.

I discovered this for myself in the Fall 1994 semester, when I taught an advanced speaking class that was amazingly diverse: their ages ranged from 17 to 40, with the variety of life experience and interests that you'd expect from such an age range. The class included students with academic, business/professional, and social/cultural reasons for having enrolled in the Intensive English Program. There were two brand-new high school graduates hoping to start undergraduate work in the U.S. the next semester, one student whose undergraduate admission was conditional on his raising his TOEFL score, four graduates of foreign universities intending to do graduate work in the U.S. in fields as diverse as Constitutional Law,

Russian Studies, business, and biology, and three current university students on leave of absence from their universities in Korea and Japan who had no immediate plans to enroll in a U.S. college or university, but who did have a strong interest in experiencing life on an American university campus. One student was a businessman sent by his company for a year's immersion in the English language and U.S. culture, while the last student, the wife of a graduate student, was most interested in adapting to life in the U.S.

While their knowledge of English grammar was extensive, their oral fluency ranged from immensely fluent to immensely hesitant, and their ability to put their structural knowledge to use also varied considerably. Even among the extremely fluent speakers, there was little or no familiarity with many of the social or academic conventions of English language use. There was also great variation in vocabulary and collocation errors. Their previous exposure to U.S. culture in general and "classroom culture" in particular, their interest in learning more about U.S. culture, and their out-of-class access to language informants and cultural informants were equally varied.

Teaching this class helped me to come up with a definition of *pedagogic task* that works for me: a clearly defined activity that arises out of students' stated needs, that allows students to focus productively on both language and the language learning process, that acknowledges the interrelatedness of the various aspects of language "proficiency"--skills, learning strategies, cognitive factors, affective factors, and grammatical, strategic, discourse, sociolinguistic, and cultural competence--that involves every student in some way, and that gives students a voice in both its design and its evaluation. (This activity may be a component of a larger task.)

Teaching this class also helped me to identify three elements that seem to be necessary for a task-based course that is structured and organized, and yet flexible enough to meet both group and individual needs. These three elements are an ongoing needs assessment, collaboration between me and my students in designing tasks, and regular student assessment of their accomplishment of these tasks.

1. <u>An ongoing needs assessment</u>

I started the semester by giving my students a list of my hopes for the course. I then asked the students to circle which of these matched their hopes for the course and to write down anything else that they hoped to get from the course. Before collecting these sheets, I made it clear that I didn't expect every student to have the same answers. (The variety of students' hopes, expectations, and goals is evident in these examples of what they wrote: I hope to get accustomed to Americans' speaking style. I hope to understand slang. I hope to learn about American business. I hope to learn about the life of American students. I hope to enjoy watching TV. I hope to improve my grammar/vocabulary/fluency/ confidence. I hope to raise my TOEFL score.) I followed this up with two sets of small-group discussion questions (Appendix 1) so that they and I would start to learn about the experience, needs, hopes, fears, strengths, and weaknesses that each student had brought to the class.

During the first week of the semester, we continued to have small-group discussions in which students answered such questions as, "In what situations are you most comfortable speaking in English?" "In what situations are you least

comfortable?" and "What English language resources are easily available to you?" "Which do you feel most comfortable using?" "Which do you feel least comfortable using?" "Why?"

From these small-group discussions, I got additional information about what the group as a whole and each individual student had brought to the class, and the students found out more about their classmates. They also got tips from their classmates on strategies for handling difficult situations. (One student, for example, said that whenever she thinks there's any chance of her having to leave a telephone message, she writes down and rehearses the message before making the call.) Another first-week activity was for each student to fill out a personal information sheet about their background and their needs. The final question was, "List the specific things that you want to know how to do well by the end of the semester." Group discussion of the answers to this question provided a list of target tasks, some of which were common to all students, and some of which applied only to some students. For example, every student wanted "participate fluently in class discussions, " "get information by telephone," and "make travel arrangements" on the class target-task list. Some target tasks that appeared only on some students' lists were "make formal oral presentations" and "take good lecture notes."

From the start of the semester, I followed a suggestion in the textbook that was assigned for this course (Matthews 1994) and had every small discussion group choose a discussion leader, a recorder, and a reporter. After every discussion, the members of each group looked through the recorder's notes and decided together what information each group's reporter should include in sharing the results of the

discussion with the rest of the class.

Throughout the semester, I unobtrusively moved from group to group during the small-group discussions and jotted down language use problems that I observed--sometimes grammar problems, sometimes word choice, sometimes tone or register--and periodically passed out Language Use sheets that students worked on in small groups. This allowed them to focus on form in a way that was directly related to their needs.

Because I see cultural competence as a component of language proficiency, and because I recognized that students came to this class with particular interests, during the second week of the semester, I had students brainstorm, in groups of 4-5, topics of interest to them--not necessarily topics that they wanted to talk about themselves, but topics that they wanted to learn about. Each group passed in its brainstorming list, and I typed a master list of topics for the class to look at so that they could come up with topics of common interest. They came up with these four broad topics of common interest:

education
love and marriage
myths and superstitions
the lives of males and females.

This list gave me additional ideas for possible tasks.

All throughout the first two weeks, I scheduled individual 15-minute out-of-class conferences with students to give them a chance to talk to me about their individual backgrounds, needs, strengths, and weaknesses. (I continued to schedule time for 15-minute conferences every day throughout the semester so that students

could sign up whenever they needed to meet with me.)

All of these activities in the first two weeks of the semester gave enough information about the students for us to start working on designing tasks that both they and I saw as worthwhile.

2. Collaboration with students in designing tasks

During the semester, students worked on three major projects. They also worked on smaller tasks--some of them self-designed--but I am going to focus here on the three major projects. Each project gave them increasingly more responsibility for designing tasks that would meet their particular needs. The first projects were all chosen from a list of suggestions that I provided. Some students designed their second project with little or no help from me, and some chose from my list of suggestions. Nobody used the list of suggestions for the third project.

One task on the first list of suggestions gave students the opportunity to work on academic listening, notetaking, and small-group discussion skills, and was on the topic of sex and gender. This task involved a number of activities.

First, the four students who chose this task watched a one-hour videotape that was part of a college-level Introductory Psychology course designed to be taught via video. While watching the videotape in the library media center, where I had put it on reserve for several days, the students were to do the following: note down what was easy or difficult to understand and try to determine why, note down what they had done when it was difficult to understand something, take notes on the information about sex and gender that was presented in the video, and make a note of anything about which they wanted to ask or comment. After that, the four students met during class time for a small-group discussion following guidelines

that I gave them. The discussion focused on three things: the process of listening and notetaking--including the strategies that they had used--the content of the video, and an evaluation of each of the four sets of notes. They then had a chance to ask me questions and to discuss their reactions to the information that had been presented in the video. Finally, they worked together on a short oral presentation to their classmates about what information in the video had most interested each of them.

As student-designed projects later in the semester, one student demonstrated how students could benefit from using the Internet. Two others designed a set of role-plays of situations involving the telephone; they performed the role-plays for their classmates and then passed out copies of the role-plays so that their classmates could use them for reference. Another student-designed project was a very well-received lesson on slang and idioms that was based on the TV program, *Melrose Place*. The student who designed this project consulted with me several times outside class while she was planning her presentation. Some of the other students also consulted frequently with me outside class while others consulted with me very little or not at all.

Throughout the semester, students spent some class time working on each of their three projects (sometimes individually, sometimes in small groups, and sometimes as a whole class -- e.g., when they gave interim reports on their projects), some class time doing textbook-related activities that focused on appropriate language and behavior to meet specific academic and social needs, and some class time having small-group discussions, doing role-plays and/or making oral

presentations of some kind (e.g., a panel discussion, informal presentations, and formal presentations, which sometimes included a question and answer session afterwards). Two students, for example, after doing some reading from *Working Woman* magazine on ethical questions in American business, did a role-play for the rest of the class of a meeting with a business adviser and a client who wanted advice on how to handle a specific ethical dilemma. The magazine article on ethical questions came from me, and the decision to use the article as the basis of a role-play came from the two students. They followed up their role-play with a question and answer session about whether their classmates agreed with the advice that the "business adviser" had given, and, if not, what advice they would give.

During the oral presentations, students took notes. Because all of them did not have academic goals, I told those who felt no need to develop note-taking skills that they should just jot down anything that particularly interested them in each presentation. I told the class that their notes would be used some time later for an assignment. For example, sometimes they were used for a group discussion of the information that had been presented. After the three presentations--one of which was a panel discussion--that were part of the first project, students took a practice short-essay test using the information from their notes. They then worked in groups to decide on the best answers to each of the questions. After the second set of oral presentations, students used their notes to write three questions that they thought a content-course teacher might ask on a quiz. Then we discussed both the appropriateness and the linguistic accuracy of their questions. They then worked in groups to write answers to the questions, and finally, compared each group's

answers, deciding which answers they thought were particularly good ones, and why. In both of these cases, the "non-academic" students were less involved in the writing of essay answers and more involved in the discussion and analysis afterwards.

3. <u>Students' assessment of task accomplishment</u>

Whenever I had students assess their task accomplishment, I had them focus on different things at different points in the semester and at different points in each project. Besides the group assessment of essay answers that I have just described, students did several other kinds of assessment. For example,

a) students gave informal interim reports on each of their three projects. Sometimes in small groups and sometimes in a full-class discussion, they let the rest of us know what their project was, what they hoped to get out of it, what they'd done so far, what had been easy and not so easy, what had been enjoyable and not so enjoyable, and what their next step was. Their classmates had a chance to ask them questions and to offer suggestions, and they had a chance to ask for help--both from me and from their classmates.

For me, it was interesting to find that what students hoped to get out of a task was seldom the development of a specific language skill. For their second project, for example, only one student said, "I want to improve my listening ability." All of the other reasons were similar to these: "Every country has myths and I want to find out more about myths" (from the student who had decided to watch a video from the *Power of Myth* PBS series and take notes on it). "I want to get

information for myself for my future travelling; especially I want information about expenses" (from a student who was going to plan a 5-day trip to Las Vegas). "As you know, I'm a businessman. I have to face many cases of ethical dilemmas every day in my job. I want to see some ethical dilemmas in American business"; and "[b]usiness wasn't my major in Korea but my friends are advising me to change my field to business in graduate school. I want to find out what I might experience in business" (from the two students who did some reading on everyday ethical dilemmas in business and then presented a role-play).

b) I also had them pass in a preparation sheet to me for each project, and I encouraged them to schedule an appointment with me to discuss their preparation sheets (Appendix 2).

c) At the end of my students' first projects, I gave most of them handouts so that they could assess their performance in the small-group discussion that had been part of their projects, and I gave the remaining students a handout so that they could assess their preparation and presentation of the panel discussion that they had presented (Appendix 3). I had them pass in their self-assessment sheets and schedule a conference with me to talk about them. This gave both the students and me additional information about their strengths, weaknesses, and needs.

d) For the students' second and third projects, the self-assessment and peer assessment sheet focused on the students' delivery of the formal or informal oral presentation that was a required part of at least one of these two projects. This sheet was taken from their textbook, *Speaking Solutions*, and modified very slightly. Each student met with me individually outside class to talk about how she or he had assessed her or his own presentation. Each of their classmates and I also filled

out an assessment sheet and gave it to the presenter so that presenters could compare their assessment of their presentation with their classmates' and my assessment as members of the audience.

Conclusion

I believe that this approach helped my students to improve in the areas where *they* saw a clear need for improvement. One student, for example, was taken aback by his classmates' perception of him as abrasive and argumentative in small-group discussions and in the question-answer sessions after the first set of oral presentations. He decided to work during the semester on how to come across as less confrontational because he was afraid that being perceived as abrasive and overly confrontational would be a handicap in graduate school. Another student said that he was very glad to have learned how to deal with travel agents and car rental agencies while he was preparing for his trip to Las Vegas. (In fact, his presentation inspired one classmate to plan a trip to Montreal over a long weekend, and another to join AAA.) The student whose area of interest was Constitutional Law felt that she had learned a great deal about the three topics that she researched during the semester: the Brady Bill, court cases related to euthanasia, and the legal rights of disabled people. Because she was disabled, she had been especially interested in researching the last topic. She also felt that as a result of preparing for a panel discussion and an informal oral presentation for our class and answering our questions afterwards, she had become better able to explain complicated legal issues to laypeople, an ability that was not language-specific: This ability, she believed, would also serve her well when she returned to Japan and would be explaining

such issues in Japanese.

I felt that this class gave me the opportunity to enhance my students' language proficiency by creating conditions in which they were able to engage in meaningful interaction while their primary attention was focused not on explicit features of the language but on understanding the language, using the language, doing something with the language that they needed to do (Kumaravadivelu 1993).

I think that there were two main reasons for my students' and my feeling that this course had been worthwhile: First, the course honored the complex interrelationships of all of the factors that influenced what and how each student learned. Second, the students themselves were an integral part of what shape the course took: They had a clear voice in deciding what projects to work on, with whom to work, and how long to spend on a project, and a voice in evaluating the effectiveness of each task. They also, I think, came to see that the skills and knowledge that they were acquiring were a result of the efforts made by the members of a three-way partnership: each individual learner, the other students in the class, and me.

Appendix 1

Directions: In small groups, please ask and answer the following questions. (The group recorder will take notes so that each group can share its information with the rest of the class.)

1. What's your name and where are you from?

2. Did you study English in your country?

   If yes:

   - How long did you study? Where did you study? (e.g., in secondary school language classes, in a private language school...)
   - How long has it been since you last studied English in your country?
   - Please tell us about an English class that you enjoyed.
   - Please tell us about an English class that you didn't enjoy.

3. Are you a new student or a continuing student in the IEP?

   If you are a continuing student:

   - How have your IEP classes been similar to English classes in your country?
   - How have your IEP classes been different from English classes in your country?
   - What advice or suggestions do you have for your classmates about living here in Ithaca and studying in the IEP? (Any additional suggestions?)

4. Have you studied English outside your country anywhere else besides Ithaca?

   If yes:

   - Where have you studied?
   - How long did you study there?
   - What did you like about studying there?
   - What did you not like about studying there?

Directions: In small groups, please ask and answer the following questions. (The group recorder will take notes so that each group can share its information with the rest of the class.)

1. Why have you enrolled in the IEP?

2. How do you hope to benefit from studying English at Cornell?

3. What worries you about studying in the IEP? About living in Ithaca?

4. What do you plan to do after this semester is over?

(5. What questions do you want to ask your classmates or Maureen?)

Appendix 2

Oral Presentation Preparation Sheet Name_____

Date_____

1. What form will my presentation take?

2. What do I want the audience to know after this presentation that they don't know now?

3. How much presentation time will I need?

4. Do I have enough information now to start a first draft of my presentation? (If not, what is missing?)

5. Do I need any visual aids (e.g, maps, pictures, overheads)? If so, what and why?

6. What areas of strength should I make use of and what areas of weakness should I try to correct and/or compensate for? (How can I compensate for them?)

Appendix 3

Self-assessment
Small-group discussion #1

Name_____

Date_____

1. In your group, how much did you talk?
   a. _____not at all or virtually not at all
   b. _____only a little
   c. _____enough but not a lot
   d. _____a lot but not too much
   e. _____so much that I dominated the discussion

If your answer was **a** or **e**, why?

If your answer was **c** or **d**, why?

If your answer was **b**, what could you do to make your answer **c** or **d** next time?

2. What did you do to help the discussion flow productively?

3. What did you do to keep the discussion from flowing productively?

4. How much did you enjoy the discussion?
   a. _____not at all
   b. _____very little
   c. _____somewhat
   d. _____rather a lot
   e. _____very much

Why?

5. How common is this type of small-group discussion in college/university classes in your country?

Self-assessment
Panel discussion #1

Name_____

Date_____

1. Why did you choose a panel discussion?

2. How did you and your co-presenters decide on a topic?

3. How closely did you work together on gathering information?

4. How easy or difficult was it to gather information?

   How could I have helped to make it easier?

5. What did you enjoy about this activity?

6. What did you not enjoy?

7. Did you benefit from doing this activity? If not, why not? If so, in what way(s)?

References

Canale, Michael and Merrill Swain. 1980. Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. Applied Linguistics. I, 1. 1-47.

Clair, Nancy. 1994. Informed choices: Articulating assumptions behind programs for language minority students. ERIC/CLL News Bulletin. 18, 1. 5.

Ellis, Rod. 1994. The study of second language acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kumaravadivelu, B. 1993. The name of the task and the task of naming: Methodological aspects of task-based pedagogy. In Graham Crookes and Susan M. Gass (Eds.), Texts in a pedagogical context (pp. 69-89). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Long, Michael H. and Graham Crookes. 1992. Three approaches to task-based syllabus design. TESOL Quarterly. 26, 1. 27-56.

Matthews, Candace. 1994. Speaking solutions. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Nunan, David. 1989. Designing tasks for the communicative classroom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, David. 1991. Communicative tasks and the language curriculum. TESOL Quarterly. 25, 2. 279-295.

Stevick, Earl W. 1971. Adapting and writing language lessons. Washington, D.C.: Foreign Service Institute.

Tikunoff, William J. 1985. Applying significant bilingual instructional features in the classroom. Rosslyn, VA: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.